DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
BALTIMORE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P. O. BOX 1715
BALTIMORE, MARYLAND 21203-1715

ACQUISITION PLAN

PROJECT: Two Cost Reimbursable Type Fixed Price Contracts, One Firm Fixed, Two (8A) Contracts for Architect-Engineer Hazardous, Toxic, Radioactive Waste (HTRW) for Various Military and Non-Military Locations, within the North Atlantic Division and Other Mission Areas.

Prepared By: _____ Date: 2 July 98
JEAN PETTY
Contract Specialist

Approved and Reviewed : _____ Date: 3 Jul 98
TOM MEYER, [redacted]
Program Manager

Approved and Reviewed by: _____ Date: 6 July 98
SANJIB CHAKI
Design Manager

Approved and Reviewed by: _____ Date: 7/17/98
ANTHONY R. RICCIO
Acting Chief, HTRW Branch

Approved and Reviewed by: _____ Date: 6 July 98
STANISLAW P. GEMBICKI, Jr. P.E.
Chief, Engineering Division

Approved and Reviewed by: _____ Date: 23 July 1998
ANTHONY F. LEKETA, P.E.
Chief, Programs & Project Management Division

SADBU Review by: _____ Date: 23 July 98
PATRICIA A. HUBER
Small Business and Small Disadvantage Business Specialist

Approved and Reviewed by: _____ Date: 17 July 98
GEORGE M. KINGSLEY
Chief, Office of Counsel

Approved and Reviewed by: _____ Date: 98 JULY 17
JEROME T. RIFKIN
Chief, Contracting Division

Concurred by: _____ Date: 7 JL 98
WILLIAM C. RYAN
Contracting Officer

Approved and Reviewed By: _____ Date: 23 July 98
BRUCE A.BERWICK
Colonel, District Engineer

Reviewed By: _____ Date: 3/23/99
(HQUSACE) General Counsel memo, 2 Dec 98 & CENAB E-mail, 16 Feb 99 incorporated

Approved By: _____ Date: 3/15/99
Principal Assistant Responsible
for Contracting

"For Official Use Only"

ACQUISITION PLAN

HAZARDOUS TOXIC AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE

ARCHITECT-ENGINEER PLAN

Plan developed for: A five year Brooks Act acquisition strategy of Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity Contracts to include two Cost Reimbursable/Firm Fixed-Price Type Contracts: $25M each - 5 year Contracts, One Firm Fixed-Price $15M each - 5 year, and Two Firm Fixed-Price 8(a) Set-Aside $3M each - 3 year Contracts for Investigation and Remedial Design Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Waste Projects for various Military and Non-Military Locations, within the North Atlantic Division (ME, MA, CT, RI, NH, VT, PA, NY, NJ, DE, MD, VA, WV, and the District of Columbia) and other Mission Areas (with prior approval of HQ, USACE). This acquisition plan reflects the guidance in Army Procurement Policy Alert Bulletin 97-012 (25 Sep 97) in that it makes maximum practical, prudent use of Indefinite Delivery Contracts, and is applicable to both Army and Non-Army missions. As described below, the recurring needs described below cannot be satisfied by existing contracts during the next five years. Two $25M Cost Reimbursable/Firm Fixed-Price Type, one $15M Firm Fixed-Price, and two 8(a) set-aside Contracts will be awarded. Should the requirements during the life of the four (4) contacts become inadequate for our current mission, at the suggestion of the PARC, it is proposed that CENAB be in a position to award an Emergency contract.

A. ACQUISITION BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

(i). Statement of Need: Under various hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste (HTRW) programs (e.g., the Defense Environmental Restoration Program for Active and Formerly Used Defense Sites, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Superfund (EPA), and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act Permitting and Corrective Actions, Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP), Support For Others (SFO) and various other Federal and State HTRW programs) the Corps of Engineers conducts pre-design investigations and remedial designs for various military, civil works, and support for others projects. The ultimate goals of these programs are to assess the human health and environmental risks of HTRW contamination, and, if warranted, to design remedial or corrective measures to remediate the contamination. Frequently, conventional contracts cannot be procured quickly enough to meet Department of Defense-mandated goals for site remediation, regulatory compliance deadlines to avoid Notices of Violation (NOV), levy of fines, or adverse effects on human health or the environment or both. Furthermore, both the Department of Defense and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency are under pressure to remediate sites as quickly as possible while abiding by regulatory criteria. This means it is crucial to complete studies and design as quickly as possible in order to move projects to the remediation

(construction of remedial /corrective action measures) phase. Recently the U.S. Corps of Engineers has also been assigned the Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) program which was initiated by the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) under authorities granted by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. Its mission is to identify, evaluate, and clean up or control sites where residual radioactivity exceeding current guidelines remain from activities supporting the atomic energy program and other sites assigned to DOE by Congress. Most FUSRAP sites were involved in work for the Manhattan Engineer District (MED) during World War II or in subsequent nuclear activities for AEC. The FUSRAP program was transferred from DOE to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in October 1997. Therefore, the Baltimore District proposes to use multiple Cost plus Fixed Fee Type Architect Engineer (AE) Contracts for pre-design investigations and remedial designs. Following the award of these contracts and based on the utilization of these contracts, the remaining contracts described in this acquisition plan will be awarded as needed. DFARS 207.104 (a)(D) requires a process for updating the acquisition plan. Prior to award of any follow-on contracts planned for award beyond 3 years from the PARC approval of this plan, the Baltimore District will confirm in writing to the PARC the applicability of this approved plan to such follow-on contracts.

(ii). Applicable Conditions: The contractor must possess an in-depth knowledge of all HTRW federal and state environmental statues and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulations. The contractor shall have sufficient staff, flexibility, and technical/ administrative capability to be available on an as needed basis.

In order to begin to understand the waste problems in the United States, Congress created the Solid Waste Disposal Act in 1965. The goal of the legislation was to provide funding so that each State could study and compile information on its waste disposal problems and practices, and to assist States in dealing with the problem of open burning dumps. Additionally, funding was made available for the development of State solid waste management plans.

By the mid 1970's, Congress recognized that the careless disposal of waste products was contaminating surface soil, water, and groundwater as well as contributing to air pollution. In order to combat the problem, Congress virtually rewrote the Solid Waste Disposal Act and created the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), which was passed in 1976. The Federal statute is officially named the Solid Waste Disposal Act, although it is most commonly known as RCRA.

The goal of RCRA is to promote the protection of health and the environment and to conserve valuable material and energy resources. RCRA has kept in stride with current waste management issues and problems by way of Congressional amendments, the most notable of which occurred in 1984 with the passage of the Hazardous and Solid Waste Act (HSWA) amendments. RCRA reauthorization bills are currently being proposed by members of Congress in an attempt to address new issues.

National programs to clean up the environment and protect the public have seen considerable growth since the 1970's. When Congress enacted the National Environment Policy Act in 1969, the Clean Air Act in 1970 and the Clean Water Act in 1972 it did so with the premise that, by slowing the rate at which contaminants were added to the Nation's air and surface waters, natural attenuation would eventually clean the air and water.

The Comprehensive Environmental, Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) was enacted by Congress in December 1980. This was the first major response to the problem of abandoned waste sites throughout the nation resulting from past activities. In order to carry out the provisions of the law, Congress authorized $1.6 billion over 5 years. This amount of money, and subsequently the law, became known as the "Superfund". EPA is responsible for managing the program, including site investigation, cleanup, and enforcement activities.

(iii) Cost:

Type of IDIQ Contract	Min. Guarantee	Max. Contract Value	Task Order Limit
Cost Reimbursable with Fixed Fee & Fixed Price Unrestricted (Hybrid) (2)	$100k each	$25M - 5 yrs	None
Firm Fixed-Price Unrestricted (1)	$30k	$15M - 5 yrs	None
Firm Fixed-Price 8(a) Set-Aside (2)	$18k each	3M - 3 yrs	None

(iv) *Capability of Performance*: Work will consist of studies, investigations and designs of various hazardous, toxic, and radioactive waste (HTRW) sites. It also includes, but is not limited to, decision documents, permit acquisition, and engineering advice during construction. HTRW sites may be: (1) currently owned or controlled by the Federal Government, either military or civilian agencies, (2) Formerly Used Defense Sites (FUDS), (3) Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) sites or (4) other sites where the Baltimore District is authorized to perform HTRW studies, investigations, designs, or construction. Remediating HTRW sites is often complicated. While the goal is obvious to protect human health and environment; the methodology to accomplish the goal is not always evident. The HTRW process of investigation, study and design, is not an "exact science" and unforeseen conditions can and will surface at any juncture. These conditions with associated risks frequently preclude costs from being estimated with sufficient accuracy to use firm fixed-fee type contracts. As a result the introduction of these unforeseen conditions adversely impacts project schedules and district missions and results in costly and time consuming modifications to AE contracts. Protection of human health and the environment requires responsiveness.

There is a need for timely response in situations where human health and safety are being endangered. Conventional firm fixed-price contract acquisition development and approval processes do not lend themselves to a quick turnaround and only further

complicate the situation. The use of cost plus fixed fee contracts will allow the Government to make maximum utilization of the Contractor's resources and alter work priorities when problems and/or changes occur. We propose procuring cost plus fixed fee IDIQ contracts with the option for firm fixed-price task orders to provide for maximum flexibility and appropriate use of this contract capacity. A cost task order will be used when the uncertainties involved in contract performance do not permit costs to be estimated with sufficient accuracy to use any type of fixed price contract. It is part of the contracting process to comply with the standard elements of the FAR. The requirements set forth in FAR 16.301-3 are clear and will be met along with the many other requirements in the FAR such as EEO clearance, congressional notification, pre-award survey and cost reasonableness. The contracts will be audited by DCAA prior to award. The cost accounting system review and approval by DCAA is a standard part of the audit.

Task orders will be considered on an individual basis and incentives for each will be project specific. Since each task order will be considered on an individual basis, we feel that these contracts will not be difficult to administer. The incentives cannot be discussed because they will be issued by task order depending on the specific needs of the projects. At this point we have general requirements. If we had specifics we would have to use another contract type other than Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quality Contracts.

The need for Firm Fixed-Price (FFP) Type Contracts still exists and is part of this acquisition strategy. We propose utilizing Unrestricted and 8(a) FFP contractors for activities on sites where the scope can be definitized and the work is generally straightforward.

Design contracts of this type are not part of any acquisition-streamlining program. These contracts are not specifically designated by the required agency as a program subject to acquisition streamlining. These contracts are Architect – Engineering contracts, which are governed by the Brooks Act.

(v) Existing Contracts: Currently, Baltimore District has two large Firm Fixed Price Indefinite Type Delivery Contracts (IDTC). These two Contracts have been extremely successful in saving the Government several million dollars. During execution of several Task Orders that were not straight forward we had to award numerous modifications to account for the changes in scope, this indicates a need for cost reimbursable type contacts in our acquisition strategy. These contacts expire during early part of 2Q FY '99. The Contract capacities of these two large IDTCs were $75,000,000.00 each for a period of 5 years. The total A-E obligation utilized to date has been approximately $60,000,000.00 and the future expects to hold obligations as indicated in the Tables below.

(vi). Projected Workload:

(EN: Engineering – CO: Construction)

Military HTRW Mission Areas:

TYPE	FY 99 ($M)		FY 00 ($M)		FY 01 ($M)		FY 02 ($M)		FY 03 ($M)		TOTAL ($M)
DERP-IRP	EN 15	CO 9	EN 17	CO 9	EN 20	CO 8	EN 20	CO 9	EN 18	CO 12	137
DERP-FUDS	EN 9	CO 1	EN 4	CO 3	EN 2	CO 5	EN 2	CO 4	EN 1	CO 4	35
OMA	EN 7	CO 3	EN 7	CO 3	EN 7	CO 3	EN 7	CO 3	EN 7	CO 3	50
BRAC	EN 12	CO 10	EN 12	CO 12	EN 12	CO 14	EN 12	CO 14	EN 12	CO 14	124
TOTAL	43	23	40	27	41	30	41	30	38	33	346

Non-Military HTRW Mission Areas:

TYPE	FY 99 ($M)		FY 00 ($M)		FY 01 ($M)		FY 02 ($M)		FY 03 ($M)		TOTAL ($M)
SFO	EN 1	CO	EN 1	CO	EN 1	CO	EN 1	CO	EN 1	CO	5
FUSRAP	EN 12	CO 180	EN 1	CO 60	EN 10	CO 280	EN 7	CO 3	EN	CO	553
USEPA	EN 2	CO 42	EN 2	CO 30	EN 2	CO 30	EN 2	CO 30	EN 2	CO 30	172
TOTAL	15	222	4	90	13	310	10	33	3	30	730

The "CO" column represents construction placement anticipated after the investigations and designs have been completed under the appropriate AE contracts.

The above mentioned projected workload is based on the following factors:

DERP-IRP, DERP-FUDS, OMA, SFO, USEPA: Actual FY97 Workload awarded during FY97, second update of FY98 Workload update, and first update of FY99 Workload prepared by the Design Leaders responsible for managing the program, and using an projected growth of 5% for the out years.

BRAC: Actual FY97 Workload awarded during FY 97, second update of FY98 Workload update, and based on the BRAC program for the out years.

FUSRAP: The program has been transferred to Corps of Engineers in FY 98. Corps has submitted 90-day report to the Congress. The projected workload is based on the report submitted to the Congress.

The above Tables shows a healthy workload of $248M dollars for engineering for next five years. Often times NAB also gets involved in helping other sister districts. Based on the above and assuming approximately 50% of the projected workload would be funded, it is proposed that the contracts outlined in this acquisition plan be awarded.

(vii) Trade-off:

Among the goals of cost, capability or performance and schedule, cost cannot by law be considered in AE selection. (See PL 92-582, as amended; to U.S.C. 541-544).

(viii) Risks:

a. Technical Risks

(1) The HTRW process of investigation, study, and design, is not an "Exact science" and unforeseen conditions can and will surface at any juncture.
(2) The requirements may be changed based on customer direction, and regulatory requirements.
(3) State of the art, innovative technologies may be implemented during the course of investigation/design.

b. Schedule Risks

(1) Government review may take longer than expected.
(2) Design directives to start or proceed to the next phase of design may be delayed.

(3) Higher headquarters or Congress could reprogram funding.
(4) OSD direction to revise construction sequencing.
(5) User requested changes.
(6) Delays in contracts managed by other government agencies.

c. Cost Risks

(1) Inflation
(2) Lack of adequate funding in the appropriate fiscal year
(3) Changes during design and construction
(4) Cost overrun

B. PLAN OF ACTION

(i). Proposed Sources and Basis for Selection: The proposed initial procurement will be synopsized in the Commerce Business Daily, in accordance with FAR 5.203, for 30 days, notifying Architect-Engineers of the Corps Of Engineers intent. Two unrestricted cost plus fixed fee (CPFF)/firm fixed-price (FFP), one unrestricted firm fixed-price, and two 8(a) set-aside firm fixed-price type contracts will be awarded. The contracts proposed are for investigation and remedial design for the hazardous, toxic and radioactive waste projects at various military and non-military installations. This notice will also indicate that any one contractor can only win one of the contracts. This will provide for a diversity of contractors to disburse the work. There will be a separate selection board for each Commerce Business Daily announcement. (One for CPFF, one for FFP and two for 8A set aside.) Each contract will be awarded as quickly as administratively possible. A management plan will be prepared to control the cost associated with the issuance of a cost task order in this contract and would entail a detailed written plan tailored to the specific project needs and to our standard systems to insure effective cost management. The plan will be developed for that occasion when a cost task order is required. While cost overruns are a major consideration when such task orders have been issued, past performance in the management of costs contracts indicates that we have the expertise on board and the necessary systems to insure that an overrun will not occur. Task orders are managed utilizing a written design quality management plan to include cost. This is our present procedure and certainly will be utilized on cost task orders. In accordance with FAR 16.103, "selecting the contract type is generally a matter for negotiation and requires the exercise of sound judgment ". The factors that will be considered are covered in FAR 16.104.

(ii). Competition: Full and Open Competition will be accomplished using Architect Engineers Procedures as outlined in FAR 36.600. Competition for Government A-E contracts in the Baltimore District has historically been very high. There are typically 50 submissions for the routine multi-disciplined contracts, which are similar in complexity but much smaller in dollar value. Small business participation will not be limited by this procurement and they will have to compete in the unrestricted

environment. There is a very favorable environment for small business participation through joint venture arrangements and through extensive subcontracting goals that will be imposed in the contract.

(A) Small Business Considerations: The planned contracts are unrestricted, with the exception of two $3M 8(a) set aside. This determination was made due to the complexity and size of the requirement. In addition, DFARS 19.219.502-1 and 70(b) has established A-E procurement as part of the competitive demonstration program and cannot be set aside for small business. There are well over 200 A-E firms in the Baltimore/Washington area that will be attracted to this procurement, as well as numerous firms throughout the United States. The Baltimore District expects a highly competitive atmosphere. We, therefore, anticipate 50 or more submissions for this procurement. The procurement will be synopsized in the Commerce Business Daily in accordance with FAR 5.203 for 30 business days notifying Architect-Engineering firms of the Corps of Engineers' intent to award a series of Cost Plus Fixed Fee and Firm Fixed Price IDC. The announcement will be amended in accordance with this plan. Firms will be required to submit SF 254's and SF 255's in accordance with PL-92-583 (Brooks Act procedures). This is not an announcement for low bidders or drawings and specifications.

Small businesses can compete as primes. However, small businesses and small disadvantaged businesses will be encouraged to team with other small businesses and large businesses to offer the most highly qualified team to the Government, which is paramount to the success of the HTRW effort. Placement of the requirements under the Minority Business Enterprise program in accordance with DFARS 219.803(c) was considered, followed by the set-aside order of precedence in DFARS 219.504(b) and found not to be conducive due to the complexity and magnitude of the requirement. However, small business and small disadvantaged businesses as the prime, are encouraged to team with other small, small disadvantaged businesses, and large businesses. If the selected firm is a large business the A-E will be required to submit a subcontracting plan for the base period and option period in their cost proposal. The plan must be consistent with Section 806 (b) (2) or PL 100-180, PL 95-507 and PL 99-661.

If contract award under the unrestricted competition is to a large business, the goal is to place at least 65% of the total planned subcontracting dollars with small business concerns. The goal is to place at least 15% of the total planned subcontracting dollars with small disadvantaged businesses, to include Historically Black Colleges & Universities or Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI's) and the goal is to place at least 10% with women owned small businesses. Subcontracting opportunities will be available and enforcement methods by this contracting activity will be employed to preclude breach by the prime contractor. In accordance with FAR 19.7, a prime contractor failing to comply in good faith with the requirements of the subcontracting plan is in material breach of the contract. Further, 15 U.S.C. 637(d) (4) (F) directs that a contractor's failure to make a good faith effort to comply with the requirements of the subcontracting plan shall result in the imposition of retainage by the Contracting Officer. For improper reporting, a retainage will be held in addition to other remedies imposed by this activity, (i.e.,

issuance of an interim and or final unsatisfactory performance rating, withholding of a percentage on approved contract invoice, etc.). Maximum practicable utilization of small and small disadvantaged business and women owned small businesses are a matter of national interest with particular interest to this contracting agency. As opportunities become available for miscellaneous designs and studies, contracts will be obtained through the U.S. Small Business Administration for Minority Business Enterprise's.

To ensure that small business concerns and small and disadvantaged business concerns have the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in these procurement, the following business clauses are to be incorporated in the unrestricted solicitations:

a. Utilization of Small, Small Disadvantaged and Women Owned Small Business Concerns (FAR 52.219-8)

b. Small, Small Disadvantaged and Women Owned Small Business Subcontracting Plan (FAR 52.219-9)

c. Small, Small Disadvantaged and Women Owned Small Business Subcontracting Plan (DOD Contracts) (DFARS 52.219-7003)

d. Incentive for Subcontracting with Small Business, and Small Disadvantaged Businesses, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Minority Institutes (DFARS 52.219-7005)

(iii) Source-selection Procedures: The standard Corps of Engineers Architect Engineer selection procedures will be utilized for this procurement. These procedures are described in the following regulations:

FAR 36.6
DFARS 36.6
AFARS 236.6
EFARS 36.6
ER 715-1-16 and NAD Supplement 1
ER 715-1-4

In accordance with NAD supplement 1 to ER 715-1-16, the board chairperson shall be designated by the Director of Engineering and Technical Services, NAD, who shall also select the remainder of the board from senior professional Division members, senior professional District members nominated by the Chief, Engineering Division. The Director of Engineering and Technical Services, NAD, may delegate the authority of chairperson to any appropriate person.

A Pre-Selection Board will review data submitted by firms submitting SF 254 and SF 255's Architect-Engineer and Related Services Questionnaire, desiring to perform architect-engineer services in connection with the required services as outlined in capability or performance. A list will be compiled and submitted to the Selection Board for review, of firms who qualify in all aspects of the commerce business daily request.

The Selection Board will review records of qualified firms and submittals and four firms will be selected in order of priority. The top two firms will be sent solicitations. The designated contract specialist will negotiate the rates and conditions and submit the results to the contracting officer for approval and contract award.

Contract administration will be in accordance with FAR Part 42. The Contracting Officer will designate a representative for contract administration (Contracting Officer's Representative-COR) and issue a standard letter setting forth the duties and requirements for the position. Only experience and qualified personnel are given COR authority. When a cost type task order is issued, DCAA will become involved and assist the COR in the performance of the audits and work verification. When cost type task orders are issued, funding limits are always established.

(iv) Contracting Considerations: Procurement will be accomplished using negotiation procedures as outlined in FAR 36.606. A subcontracting plan will be required with the offer's proposal and shall be evaluated on its own merit in accordance with AL 93-10. Extensive subcontracting to Small and Small Disadvantaged business will be encouraged. To ensure that Small and Small Disadvantaged Business concerns have the maximum practicable opportunity to participate in contract performance; the appropriate Small Business Clauses will be included. The Architect-Engineers shall submit with the proposal a Small Business Subcontracting Plan which will be evaluated for compliance with statutory requirements of Public Law (PL) 95-507, 99-661, and100-656 and AL 93-7. The Plans shall provide comprehensive response to the requirements of the clause entitles, "Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business Subcontracting Plan" (FAR 52.219-9 (d) (1) through (11). Failure to submit an acceptable subcontracting plan shall make the offer ineligible for award of the contract. A Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Contract and a Firm Fixed-Price Contract is proposed for this procurement. The Small Business Plan will be a rated element in the selection process. In accordance with FAR 16.5 and EFARS 36.601-3-90(H), all firms awarded a contract with a similar scope of work will be considered for each task order. The criteria for contract selection will be technical capabilities, specific expertise, responsiveness, location, and customer satisfaction. Should any firm feel that they are not being offered a fair opportunity to compete for the work, they will be able to appeal directly to the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers ombudsman. The appeal process will be described in a contract clause.

(v) Budgeting and Funding: Funding to be cited on each acquisition.

(vi) Product Descriptions: The products obtained under these contracts will include drawings, estimates, studies, engineering reports, management reports and work products of a similar nature. Task orders will be assembled using the standard procedures that have been established by the Baltimore District A-E Branch. Tasks orders maybe awarded on a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Architect-Engineer (AE) price basis with specific completion dates with well defined deliverable for the Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Waste (HTRW) program or they maybe fixed price.

(vii) Priorities, Allocations, and Allotments: Not applicable to this procurement.

(viii) Contractor versus Government Performance: No Government functions are being replaced. This is not a commercial activities requirement and therefore the application of the OMB circular A-76 is not appropriate.

(ix) Management Information Requirements: Quarterly reports shall be submitted to CEMP-R with copies furnished to CEPR, CEMRD-CT, and the Contracting Officer. Quarterly reports shall contain orders, dollar amounts, projects, where stated project is located, program supported, and activity description of work performed.

(x) Make or Buy: This procurement will not contain any requirement which impose any percentage or minimum make or buy criteria on the prime contractor. However, it is anticipated that due to the diversity of the goods and services to be provided, the contractors will buy all items and elements needed for this procurement.

(xi) Test and Evaluation: Not applicable to this procurement.

(xii) Logistics Considerations: Work may be performed in various offices of the A-E team under the A-E's control and coordination. No commercial item will be involved in this acquisition other than those owned by the A-E's and used incidental to work. No manufacturing is involved in this acquisition. Integrated logistics support planning, the DOD mission profile, reliability, and maintainability program, the DOD Parts Control Program, and Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistics Support, are not applicable to this acquisition.

(xiii) Government-Furnished Property: N/A

(xiv) Government-Furnished Information: It is expected that information will flow from the Government to the Architect-Engineer to facilitate the execution of the work. The information will generally be available to both parties for scoping and level of effort assessment prior to the execution of a particular task order. In addition, information developed by an Architect-Engineer will become Government furnished information in succeeding or concurrent task orders. Examples of Government furnished information include, but are not necessary limited to reports if investigations, programmatic studies and documentation, manuals, regulations and specifications.

(xv) Environmental Considerations: All phases of the environmental and HTRW management including quality assurance, chemical sampling testing and analysis will be performed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Detailed record and title searches, preliminary assessment, and site investigations will be accomplished using the applicable, relevant and appropriate requirement.

(xvi) Security Considerations: N/A

(xvii) Other Considerations: N/A

(xviii) Milestones for the Acquisition:

Two $25M Cost Reimbursable Plus Fixed Fee/Firm Fixed-Price Type Contracts, one $15M Firm Fixed-Price and two 8(a) set-aside Contracts will be awarded according to the following proposed schedule

Submit from NAB to NAD:	31 July 1998
Acquisition Plan Approval:	4 Jan 1998
Issuance of Synopsis	14 Jan 1999
Pre-Selection Board	25-26 Feb 1999
Selection Board	9-10 Mar 1999
Presentation	17-18 Mar 1999
Approval of Selection	28 Apr 1999
Issuance of Solicitation	20 May 1999
Receipt of Proposal	7 June 1999
Pre POM	30 June 1999
Post POM	2 July 1999
Contract Award	1 Aug 1999

(xiv) Identification of Participants in Acquisition Plan Preparation:

Contracting Officer-William Ryals, CENAB-CT-A, 410-962-3495, william.c.ryals@NAB02.usace.army.mil

Contract Specialist, Jean Petty, CENAB-CT-A, and 410-962-2587, jean.petty@NAB02.usace.army.mil

Acting Chief, HTRW Branch, Clinton L. Anuszewski, P.E., Anthony Riccio, CENAB-EN-H, 410-962-2207, clinton.l.anuszewski@NAB02.usace.army.mil

Technical Leader, Military HTRW Section, HTRW Branch, Sanjib Chaki, P.E., CENAB-EN-HM, 410-962-3345, sanjib.chaki@NAB02.usace.army.mil

Chief, Civil HTRW Section, HTRW Branch, Sesh Lal, CENAB-EN-HN, 410-962-2778, sesh.p.lal@NAB02.usace.army.mil

Program Manager, Thomas Meyer, CENAB-PP-M, and 410-962-6781, tom.meyer@NAB02.usace.army.mil